argued for clemency were as mistaken as the Protestant bigots and "Orangeists" who called for the death sentence. The real issue in Riel's trial should have been medical, not political. Clarke's medical judgement is a more effective -- more devastating -- condemnation of Riel's politics than the more overtly political one that merely sentenced him to death.

An interesting feature of C.K. Clarke's essay is its inclusion of material from Daniel Clark's original notes. Riel's nervousness and expressiveness are attributed to his being French. Riel's pride and sense of himself as leader are turned against him as signs of insanity: "He was very talkative, and his egotism made itself manifest, not only in his movements, but also in his expressed pleasure in being the central figure of a State trial, which was likely to become historic" (15). A principal focus of Clark's notes is Riel's resistance to the insane verdict. Clark records how, at the mention of how Riel's lawyers were trying to establish his insanity in order to save his life, Riel reacted "like a chained animal until his irons rattled" (15) -- elsewhere he is "an enraged tiger" (16). Riel's defence, that he scorned such a plea as he considered himself "`the leader of my people, the center of a national movement, a priest and prophet'" (15), is reported as only another instance of the behaviour that makes him, at least for Clark, "like the insane with delusions of greatness, whether paretics or not" (16).

Much of Daniel Clark's evidence, which C.K. Clarke reiterates as confirmation of the value of professional opinion and an example of the difficulty that it encounters in a public forum, is intuitive, based on "a hundred and one little things in appearance, movement and conversation, which cannot be described in writing" (16). One might wonder how what "cannot be described in writing" could be used to obtain a conviction in a court of law. With strange inconsistency, given his evident ability to read Riel's mind in his gestures, in nearly the same passage he accuses Riel of "concealing to some extent the inner working of his mind" and having "an object in view" (16). Besides their obvious jealously of the greater respect awarded the legal profession, and their immediate concern for the respectability of the insanity plea, both Daniel Clark and C.K. Clarke have "an object in view" -- respect for the psychiatric profession that makes such a plea on the basis of its unique experience and incommunicable lore -- of its sheer authority. If this had been respected, instead of leading a rebellion, Louis David Riel, this "mental